

REMARKS

The Office Action Summary sheet indicates the drawings remain objected to by the Examiner; however, the text of the office action states: "As to the objection to the drawings, Applicant's revision of the drawings has overcome the objection, as such; the objection has been withdrawn." Applicant understands that the objection of the drawings is withdrawn and requests that Examiner confirm the withdrawal of objection to the drawings in the next communication.

Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 10, which are now canceled. Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-26 remain for consideration. The allowability of claims 20-26 is gratefully acknowledged. All claims are thought to be allowable over the cited art.

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 15 as amended are not shown to be unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over "Park" (US Patent 6,275,079 to Park) in view of "Trimberger" (US Patent 5,811,985 to Trimberger). The Office Action does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness because the Examiner has only provided conclusory remarks about that which is basic knowledge or common sense to one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, the Office Action does not set forth evidence to support either a suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Trimberger and Park. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 10, and claims 2 and 10 are canceled. Claims 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, and 15 are amended merely to correctly name the respective claims from which they depend.

The Office Action fails to show that claim 7 is unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the Park-Trimberger combination in further view of "Krishnamurthy" (US Patent 6,271,713 to Krishnamurthy). A prima facie case of obviousness is not established for making the Park-Trimberger-Krishnamurthy combination because the alleged motivation for modifying the Park-Trimberger combination with the cited teachings of Krishnamurthy is unsupported by evidence.

The alleged motivation states that it would have been obvious to combine Krishnamurthy's teaching of inverters having well regions coupled to a voltage distribution line with Park's inverters "in order to improve the switching speed of the

circuit.” It is respectfully submitted that this alleged motivation is unsupported by evidence, and modifying Park in this manner does not in any apparent way improve the switching speed of Park’s circuit.

No evidence is presented in the Office Action to explain how Park’s switching speed would be improved by Krishnamurthy’s coupling of the voltage to the well region. Furthermore, modification of Park’s inverters (10-12 of FIG. 4) with the body bias of Krishnamurthy would not increase the switching rate of Park’s inverters because the switching rate of Park is limited by the current supplied by the respective current mirrors (PMOS transistors 14-16 and NMOS transistors 18-20 of FIG. 4). Thus, there is no apparent reason for modifying Park’s inverters with Krishnamurthy’s coupling of the voltage to the well region.

The Office Action fails to show that claims 1, 2, and 10-15 are unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over “Dortu” (US Patent 6,252,443 to Dortu et al.”) in view of Park and further in view of Trimberger. The Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as explained above in regards to the Park-Ttrimberger combination. Furthermore, the proposed modification of Dortu with teachings of Park is improper because the modification would change a principle of operation of Dortu (MPEP 2143.01). As discussed above, claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of claim 10, and claim 10 is canceled.

With respect to claim 10, which includes the limitations of Claim 2, the Examiner has failed to even allege any motivation to combine Dortu, Park, and Trimberger. That is, the Examiner has simply stated that “the references also meet the recited limitations in these claims [2 and 15]” without providing any evidence of a motivation to combine the references.

Moreover, Dortu teaches a delay line that has inverters with fixed delays, and a selectable number of inverters is included in the delay generated by the delay line (FIG. 10). Park’s inverter delay is variable with a fixed number of inverters, and the inverter delay is determined by the varied loads on the inverters in the delay line (FIG. 2; col. 2, l. 1-7). Thus, the proposed modification of Dortu by Park would fundamentally change the operation of Dortu and is improper. In fact, the respective

circuits of Dortu and Park are fundamentally different in that Dortu describes a digital delay line (see, Dortu at col. 1, ll. 63-64, "In this case, the DLL is digital") whereas Park describes an analog delay line (see, Park at Abstract, "An analog delay locked loop").

In regards to claim 11, the prior art is not shown to teach all the limitations. The cited prior art does not include the limitations of "a fast delay element having an input terminal coupled to receive a delayed version of the input clock signal routed by the first multiplexer". The Examiner indicates that the first multiplexer is "one of plurality of 115s in the top row"; however, the delayed version of the input clock signal output by "one of plurality of 115s in the top row" is not coupled to be received by any delay element. Thus, the limitations of claim 11 are not shown to be suggested by the Park-Trimberger-Dortu combination.

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11 and are not shown to be unpatentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over the Park-Trimberger-Dortu combination for at least the reasons set forth above.

The Office Action fails to show that claims 16-18 are unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over admitted prior art ("APA", Fig. 1 in the present application) in view of Park. The rejection is respectfully traversed because a prima facie case of obviousness is not established.

Item 6 of the current office action appears to repeat item 10 of the previous office action. The limitations added to claim 16 in the amendment received at the USPTO on 2/14/2005 do not appear to have been considered by the Examiner. These limitations include "at least one configuration memory cell". For ease of reference, the prior response by Applicant is repeated in part below.

Applicants' amended claim 16 sets forth "a voltage selection circuit coupled to the at least one configuration memory cell, the voltage selection circuit being responsive to the at least one configuration memory cell for selectively coupling the first voltage terminal or the second voltage terminal to the voltage distribution line". The Office Action admits to Park's failure to teach using a memory cell as a control signal of a multiplexer. Accordingly, Applicants' FIG. 1 in combination with Park fails

to suggest this limitation. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claim 16 is allowable over the combination of Applicants' FIG. 1 in view of Park.

Claims 17-18, which depend from independent Claim 16, are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Applicants' FIG. 1 and Park. While Applicants do not acquiesce to any particular rejections to these dependent claims, it is believed that these rejections are now moot in view of the remarks made in connection with independent Claim 16. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited references. Therefore, dependent Claims 17-18 are also allowable over the combination of Applicants' FIG. 1 and Park.

The Office Action fails to show that claim 19 is unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over the APA-Park combination in further in view of Krishnamurthy. The rejection is respectfully traversed because a prima facie case of obviousness is not established.

Claim 19 depends from claim 16 and a prima facie case of obviousness is not established for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 16. In addition, the Examiner has failed to provide evidence to support a motivation to combine Krishnamurthy with the APA-Park combination. Applicant's FIG. 1 does not illustrate the inverters that are to be modified by the teachings of Krishnamurthy, and the modification of Park by the teachings of Krishnamurthy is improper, as discussed above in regards to claim 7.



X-1141 US
10/719,743

PATENT
Conf. No.: 3152

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested in view of the Amendments and Remarks presented above. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,

Justin Liu
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 51,959
(408) 879-4641

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 11, 2005.

Julie Matthews
Name

Signature